

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes.
Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit
or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the
copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the
ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the
links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

Paul was neither bigoted nor intolerant. He appreciated the value of education. "He advised his pupils to learn from the surrounding world everything that was worthy in it."¹ He did not think that they must go out of the world; they may and should continue in the world.² But his opinion was unhesitating that Pagan society was so leavened and impregnated by idolatry that it must be broken up before it could be reconstituted in a form reconcilable with Christian principles. Christians may remain in the world, use its teaching, profit by its opportunities. But they must not be of the world, as a part of its society.

The more closely we scrutinize the words and acts of the leading Apostles, the more clearly does their perfect harmony in all essential points appear—amid some slight and purely superficial differences—and the better do we understand what is implied in *Galatians* ii. 2 and 9: Paul laid before James and Cephas and John the Gospel for the Gentiles, and they perceived the grace that was given him, and gave him the right hand of fellowship. This implies that they were all from the beginning in complete agreement as to what should be the position of the Gentiles in the Church and in the State.

W. M. RAMSAY.

BIBLICAL DIFFICULTIES.

I.

THE title of this short series of papers is designedly vague. The writer thought, in the first place, of problems arising out of the Massoretic text; all our elaborate historical conclusions are based upon that text, and yet no adequate, thorough examination of it has been made. Textual criticism, as has been said already in the EXPOSITOR (March, 1899), is passing into a new phase, and since it may be some time before commentators, hampered by the

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 149.

² 1 Cor. v. 10.

manifold requirements of their readers, take due account of this, it is essential that magazines concerned with exegesis should promote the general progress by giving some space to the new critical school. Following the precedent set by the writer,¹ Prof. Budde (than whom no German critic is better qualified) has undertaken the consideration of "psalm-problems" of this order in the *Expository Times*; it is excusable that the writer should feel increased confidence in his ability to serve the public by throwing what new light he can on the problems which Prof. Budde leaves to him. But there are other Biblical Difficulties on which, if not often, yet upon occasion, he will be ready to speak. And one such meets us directly, when Prof. Budde or any other scholar points out the often far-reaching corruptness of the Massoretic text, great as the fidelity of the Massoretic editors has been. For we can hardly doubt that the text of the Psalms presented much of this corruptness in the time of Jesus Christ, and yet our Lord certainly regarded the Psalms as inspired. Well, and what, pray, does the inspiration of the Scriptures mean? Surely, as Robertson Smith long ago expressed it, not merely that they "contain," but also that they "convey," the word of God. And it is this fact of experience that we ought to start from—that the Scriptures, or let us here say the Psalms, convey a true and direct message from God to the Church and each of its members. No one says that the text of the Psalms is so corrupt that no true conception of its meaning can be found; all that is asserted by advanced critics is that the details of the traditional exegesis are often incorrect, largely in consequence of the corruptness of the text. But it remains true that even corrupt passages can be interpreted according to the analogy of passages which are certainly correct, and God, who overrules all things, can even so order it that, through a perfectly incorrect representation of the meaning of the original verse or phrase, a message

radiant with beauty and truth can be conveyed to believers. So it is to-day; so, too, it has always been. The Septuagint, the versions of Jerome, of Luther, of the Authorized Translators, are all full of indubitable errors, but all, through their close connexion with the inner life of the Church and its members, acquired, as it were, a special inspiration, even where they are least correct, relatively to those who used them as authoritative. As the present writer has expressed his meaning elsewhere, "for Jesus Christ, the Psalms, in the form or forms in which they were correct, had, no doubt, a special inspiration, not only because there was no other worthy hymn book known to Him with which they could be compared, but because they were already becoming ancient; and devotional forms which have long expressed the inner experience of the Church, even now, almost in spite of ourselves, seem to us to be specially inspired." That the Psalms as originally written were, in the eyes of the psalmists and of Jewish believers, inspired, is beyond question, though this inspired quality was not such as forbade authorized persons to deal freely with them by processes which were already familiar to ancient editors.

The Psalms, then, may convey the Word of God even in a very imperfect text. That they "contain" the Word of God is also a true and an important statement, because it allows us, in the light of the indwelling Spirit of God, to discriminate between those parts of the Psalter which are in the direct line of progress towards the Gospel and those which are reactionary rather than progressive, relics of the past rather than anticipations of the future. We may now pass on to the consideration of three very instructive corruptions of the true text of passages of the Scriptures; the third, it will be seen, has to be taken in connexion with an undoubtedly corrupt passage of the recovered Hebrew text (if I may call it so) of parts of Ecclesiasticus.

I. Job xiii. 28 :

וְהוּא בָּרַקְבָּרַק בְּלֵה
בְּגַד אֲכַלְוֹ שֶׁשָּׁ

A.V. And he, as a rotten thing, consumeth, as a garment that is moth-eaten.

R.V. Though I am like a rotten thing that consumeth,
Like a garment that is moth-eaten.

The Revised Version shows a tender consideration for those who have to read the Old Testament poetry aloud. The preceding verses are a vividly impassioned expostulation with God for so inexorably and so excessively afflicting Job, who naturally speaks of himself in the first person. Then, suddenly, he seems to fall into the third person. Dillmann and Davidson think that וְהוּא can mean "and such a one," preparing the way for the next chapter, in which Job speaks of the sad lot of the race, without special reference to any individual. That this is not a satisfactory explanation is clear; therefore critics who are less opposed to alterations of the traditional text either transfer it to some other position in which it seems to read more plausibly (*e.g.*, after xiv. 2, line 1, or after xiv. 2, line 2, or after xiv. 3) or transfer xiv. 5, line 2 (R.V.), so as to stand between xiii. 27 and 28, an unnatural expedient, which produces a poor result, and for which I must refer to Duhm. Budde, however, prefers to suppose that xiii. 28 is an interpolation due to a later writer who had but a limited mastery of Hebrew style. Budde's characterization of the style of xiii. 28 as poor is certainly justified. Not only the pronoun is a stumblingblock, but the use of בָּרַקְבָּרַק, which Dillmann and others quite unwarrantably render (like A.V. and R.V.), "that which is eaten by worms," whereas elsewhere בָּרַקְבָּרַק means "rotteness," and is specially used as a synonymous parallel to וַיַּ, "the moth." Abraham Geiger long ago pointed out another and a more plausible escape from the difficulty than that of Dillmann, and more recently both

Prof. Beer (*Text des Buches Hiob*, p. 83) and Prof. Nestle (in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1900, p. 172) have suggested the same solution, viz., to take רְקֵב in Job xiv. 28 as an Aramaic loan-word meaning "skin bottle" (so LXX., Targ., Pesh., Arab., Barhebræus). The objection is (1) that there are four good Hebrew words for "skin bottle" (see *Encyclopædia Biblica*, s.v. "Bottle"), and (2) that since the parallel line contains וַיַּ, "moth" (or, at any rate, the word for some equally destructive insect), it is most unlikely that the writer would have courted misunderstanding by seeking out an Aramaic word composed of the same letters as רְקֵב, "rottenness"; parallelism would seem to most readers to necessitate the meaning "rottenness." The only remedy, as it seems to me, is carefully to consider what errors the scribe was likely to fall into while transcribing the original words, having regard to the context. Certainly the true context is xiv. 1, 2, or, at any rate, xiv. 1, that supremely melancholy verse—

Man that is born of a woman
Is of few days and full of trouble.

But can we simply transfer xiii. 28 to a position after xiv. 1? Surely not. "And he," i.e., "And such a one," would be a very unsatisfactory substitute for "Like a flower he cometh forth." It is the descriptive style that we expect, and the figure "like a flower" seems the predestined introduction to v. 2.

Yet criticism is rigorous, and we must not waive it aside. In xiv. 2, נִצְׁנָעַ בְּצִיּוֹן is not quite satisfactory; we expect נִצְׁמָח. Prof. Beer would emend נִצְׁנָעַ into נִצְׁמָח. Several other words, however, are also suspicious. It is possible that צִיּוֹן has arisen out of an accidental repetition ("ditto-graphy") of צִיּוֹן in נִצְׁנָעַ or צִמְמָה. Then, too, וַיַּבְרַא, "and flees," is no proper parallel to נִצְׁנָעַ or צִמְמָה, "springs up." Lastly, the figure of the shadow belongs more properly to the

"days" of unhappy man than to man himself (see cii. 11, cxliv. 4; Eccles. vi. 12, viii. 13).

Now let us turn back to xiii. 28. It sometimes happens that various forms of the same phrase, or even verse, are given side by side. Suppose xiii. 28 was originally a variant to xiv. 2. At once the probably true reading appears underneath the false. Read—

וְהוּא כַּפְרָח יִבֶּל Such an one is like a blossom that fadeth,
כַּפְרָח אֲכָלוּ חַסִּיל Like a vine which caterpillars have eaten.

יבֶּל for פְּרָח and כַּפְרָח for רַקְבָּה are quite normal emendations. Then we want a parallel for פְּרָח, "blossom." Remembering Joel i. 4, 7, 12, we correct כְּבָנֵד, "like a garment," into כְּנֵפֶן, "like a vine," and עַשׂ, "the moth," into חַסִּיל, "the caterpillar" (a kind of locust is meant). Now it becomes possible to bring xiv. 2 nearer to the true reading. Read—
כַּפְרָח יִצְמָח וַיַּפְלֵל Like a blossom which appeareth and fadeth,
כַּפְרָח אֲכָלוּ חַסִּיל Like a palm tree which caterpillars have eaten.
וַיַּעֲבֹד יִצְמָח כַּפְרָח וַיַּבְרֹח תְּכִמֶּר probably arises out of צִיצֵּא; represents has
וְלֹא תְּכִמֶּר, i.e. represents arisen. That there has been well-meant editorial manipulation may be granted; this accounts for the misplacing of words, and for the ingenious misinterpretation of the passage. As it stood, the passage was presumably too corrupt to be translated; some manipulation was therefore indispensable; no blame can properly be imputed to the ancient editor of Job. The result is that xiii. 28 may be omitted, and that xiv. 2 should take the form suggested above, with a various reading in the margin, כְּנֵפֶן, "like a vine," for כְּתֻמֶּר, "like a palm tree."

II. Psalm cix. 23:

כִּצְלָל בְּנִטּוֹתָו נַחֲלָבָתִי
נַשְׁתָּהִי כְּאֶרְבָּתִי

A.V. and R.V. I am gone like the shadow when it declineth; I am tossed up and down like the locust (cf. Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 315).

The passage is full of difficulties. “*I am made to go*,” a most improbable word; *הַלְךָ* in the Nif'al occurs nowhere else. Not less improbable is the parallel word *גַּנְעָרֶתִי*, which most render “*I am shaken off*” (so Driver in the *Parallel Psalter*). To this we may add that there is no parallelism between a shadow and the locust, and that elsewhere (as we have seen) it is not man, but his “days,” that are likened to a shadow. The remedy is plain. *כַּעַל* should be *בְּחַסֵּיל*, “like caterpillars”; a very similar corruption is noticed above in Job. *כַּנְטוֹתָנוּ* should be *בְּנִירֹתָנוּ*, “on the fences.” The locusts collect, in cold weather, on fences, as Nahum (iii. 17) tells us. For *גַּלְקָחוּתִי* read, of course, *גַּלְקָחוּתִי*, “*I am taken away*.” For *גַּנְעָרֶתִי* read *גַּנְעָרֶתִי*, “*I am gathered (for removal)*.” Render therefore—

Like caterpillars on the fences I am taken away,
I am gathered (for removal) like locusts.

The speaker is no mere individual, but the suffering community of Jewish believers after the Exile.

III. Ecclesiasticus xiv. 15; Psalm xlix. 11 (E.V. 10).

Dr. Schechter and others have rightly commented on the extreme imitativeness of Ben Sira, as exhibited in the fragments of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus. One of the passages of the Psalter on which Ben Sira occasionally bases his own work is Ecclesiasticus xiv. 15, which runs in the Hebrew text, as at present known to us (*Wisdom of Ben Sira*, edited by Prof. Schechter and Dr. Charles Taylor, p. 9),—

הֲלֹא לְאַחֲרֵךְ תַּשׁוּב חִילָךְ Shalt thou not leave thy riches to another,
וַיַּעֲשֵׂךְ לִיוֹדֵי גּוֹרֵל And thy labour to them that cast lots?

The original passage (part of Ps. xlix. 11) is thus given in the Received Text and Revised Version,—

יְהִיד כְּסִיל וּבָעֵר יַאֲבֹדוּ The fool and the brutish together perish,
וַיַּשְׁכַּב לְאַחֲרִים חִילָם And leave their wealth to others.

The passage in Sirach comprises the idea, which a careful study of the psalm seems to me to suggest, that the reference in the psalm to the wise and the foolish as sharing the same fate is due to corruption of the text, and having found that חסיל (a kind of locust) has to be restored in the text of Job xiii. 28, Ps. cix. 23, it is natural to suspect that כסיל may be a corruption of חסיל, and that אחרים in the parallel line, נזרך in the first, and נורל in the second, of the parallel lines of Ecclesiasticus xiv. 28 come from words descriptive of some other kind of locust. I would therefore propose to restore the two passages (Ecclus. and Ps.) in this way,—

הַלֹּא לְאַרְבָּה תִּשְׁאַב חִילָּר וַיַּנִּיעַ רַגְלֵי חַרְבוֹן יְשַׁק חַסִּיל צְבוּרִי וַיַּשְׁבֶּן לְאַרְבָּה חִילָּר	Shall thou not leave thy riches to the swarming locust? And thy labour the leaping locust shall eat. The caterpillar gnaws his treasures, And he leaves his riches to the swarming locust.
---	---

I am afraid I must add that another familiar passage (Ps. xlix. 14), supposed to contain a reference to the triumphing of the righteous over the wicked on the morning of the great day of the Lord (or on the morning after the long night of trouble), really, in all probability, does but reiterate the statement that the “treasures” (R.V., “heaps”) of the wicked rich man pass into the possession of the locust (לְאַרְבָּה for לְבָקָר). If this should turn out to be right—and if sound methods of criticism and exegesis be applied, it is not difficult to form an opinion on such a point—we shall not be at all the losers, for to see what a psalmist really meant is surely an adequate compensation for the shock occasioned by the discovery that our old interpretation was wrong. I venture to add that I have further evidence for the explanation of this “Biblical Difficulty,” but fear to encroach too much on the editor’s space. I hope to give it in my new work on the Psalms.

IV. Ecclesiasticus xlivi. 20.

צִינָת רֹוח צָפֹן יִשְׁבֶּה
וּבְرַכְבָּי קִפְיָא מִקּוֹרָה
The cold of the north wind he causeth to blow,
And congealeth his spring (*marg.*, the pond) like
rotteness (?).

The Oxford editors naturally show some hesitation in rendering “like rottenness,” which is not at all appropriate. Several attempts have been made to correct the text of the second line, but not quite satisfactorily. Dr. C. Taylor, after recording these attempts (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, April, 1898, pp. 471 f.), expresses the opinion that בְּרַכְבָּי means the same thing here as in Job xiii. 28, and seems half inclined to adopt the explanation considered above, and substitute “skin bottle” (*ἀσκός*) for “rotteness.” “Ice or water being compared in the next line to a breast-plate, it was suggested that in verse 20 it is compared to the skin of a leather bottle” (*Wisdom of Ben Sira*, p. lxiv). I confess, I do not see any parallelism between Job xiii. 28 and Ecclesiasticus xlivi. 20, nor do I think a lover of Biblical Hebrew would have gone out of his way to find an Aramaic word for “skin bottle.” There must surely be corruption, but the corrupt word is here, as so often, not the word which critics think of in the first instance. In accordance with numerous analogies, I venture to restore the second line thus, “וּבְרַלְתָּה יִקְפִּיא מִקּוֹרָה” “and he congeals ponds by his cold.”

T. K. CHEYNE.

*TRUTH IN JESUS: THE REVELATION OF CHRIST
AND THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST.*

A STUDY IN THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

“Τομεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὔτως ἐμάθητε τὸν Χριστόν· εἴγε αὐτὸν ἡκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε, καθὼς ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.”—*Eph.* iv. 20, 21.

In arguing against a relapse into pagan immorality, St. Paul definitely reminds his readers of what they had been taught in the synagogues of Asia, and more especially, perhaps, in